

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 6-23, 25-34, 36-45, 47-55, 58 and 60-68 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-3, 6-23, 25-34, 36-45, 47-55, 58 and 60-68 have been rejected.

Claims 1, 16, 19-23, 33, 34, 44, 45, 55, and 58 have been amended.

Claim 69 has been added. Support for this claim is found, at least, at p. 17, lines 14-16 of the Specification. No new matter is added.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1-3, 6-23, 25-34, 36-45, 47-55, 58, 60-68 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as purportedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. However, in order to expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended these claims to address the Examiner's concerns. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner's reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections to these claims.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1-3, 6, 8-13, 16, 19-23, 25-30, 33-34, 36-41, 47-52, 55, 58, 60-65 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as purportedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,392,540 issued to Pell ("Pell"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Applicants respectfully submit that the remarks below regarding claim 1 apply with equal force to claims 16, 19, 2-23, 33, 34, 44, 45, 55, and 58, which contain, among other limitations, substantially similar limitations as those of claim 1.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited portions of Pell fail to disclose each feature of claim 1, which has been amended as follows. As an initial matter, support for the amendments made herein is found, at least, at p. 16, lines 22-24 and p. 20, lines 9-11 of the Specification. No new matter is added.

1. A method for communicating comprising:
 - controlling a user interface presented by a web browser comprising:
 - causing a web server to push an asynchronous message to the web browser in response to an incoming event, wherein the incoming event comprises a request to establish communication with a user;
 - the web browser presents a user interface change in response to the asynchronous message, and
 - the incoming event is received by a communication server;
 - causing the web browser to provide a wait request to the web server wherein,
 - the wait request specifies a target process of a plurality of processes,
 - the processes are configured to generate asynchronous messages,
 - the wait request is associated with the web browser, and
 - the wait request enables the web server to push the asynchronous message to the web browser;
 - identifying a source of the asynchronous message, wherein the source of the asynchronous message is the target process; and
 - associating the wait request with the source, wherein the associating identifies the web browser as a recipient of the asynchronous message.

Specifically, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited portions of Pell fail to disclose, at least, a wait request that specifies a target process of a plurality of processes configured to generate asynchronous messages, wherein the specified target process is the source of an asynchronous message that is pushed to a web browser.

The Office Action cites the following passage of Pell as purportedly disclosing the claimed providing a wait request:

A support or administrative user becomes known to rendezvous service **102** by issuing a request via path **154** to identify the agent as available for processing of support requests. Such a support or administrative user essentially “logs in” to the rendezvous service through such a request via path **154**.

Having so identified an appropriate agent, rendezvous service **102** initiates via path **160** interaction service **104** to permit further interaction between the selected agent and the requesting customer or user. Specifically, interaction service **104** exchanges requests and responses with support proxy **106** and with the agent browser **110** via paths **156** and **158** , respectively.

Pell 5:40-52 (cited at Office Action, p. 4). Applicants respectfully submit that the above login procedure is not comparable to the claimed providing a wait request. The cited

portions of Pell fail to disclose that Pell's login procedure identifies a target process. In fact, the cited portions of Pell fail to disclose that Pell's login provides any information regarding the source of any messages that may be delivered to the agent. On the other hand, the claimed wait request specifies a target process of a plurality of processes configured to generate asynchronous messages.

The Office Action further postulates that Pell's disclosure of matching a particular customer to a particular agent somehow teaches identifying the source of an asynchronous message and associating a wait request with that source. Office Action, p. 4. In so doing, the Office Action attempts to equate one of Pell's customers with the claimed source of the asynchronous message. However, even if the parallels between the recited elements and the features of Pell were accurate and appropriate (a point Applicants do not concede), the claimed source of the asynchronous message is a target process specified by the wait request, one of a plurality of processes configured to generate asynchronous messages. Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed target process does not read (and cannot be read) on Pell's customers. Even if such a reading were tenable, which Applicants respectfully submit is not the case, the cited portions of Pell fail to disclose that Pell's login includes any sort of specification of a particular customer. Instead, Pell discloses a rendezvous process that applies rendezvous rules to match incoming support requests with agents who have logged in. *See* Pell 5:35-40. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited portions of Pell fail to disclose the claimed wait request that specifies a target process of a plurality of processes configured to generate asynchronous messages.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner's reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections to claims 1, 16, 19, 2-23, 33, 34, 44, 45, 55, and 58 (as well as all claims that depend therefrom) and an indication of the allowability of same.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 7, 14-15, 18, 31-32, 42-43, 53-54, 66-68 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as purportedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,392,540 issued to Pell,

in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,763,384 issued to Gupta, et al. (“Gupta”). Claim 17 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as purportedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,392,540 issued to Pell, in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,691,162 issued to Wick (“Wick”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner’s reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections to these claims and an indication of the allowability of same.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, the application and the claims therein are believed to be in condition for allowance without any further examination and a notice to that effect is solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at 512-439-5092.

If any extensions of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) are required in order for this submission to be considered timely, Applicants hereby petition for such extensions. Applicants also hereby authorize that any fees due for such extensions or any other fee associated with this submission, as specified in 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17, be charged to Deposit Account 502306.

Respectfully submitted,

/Shawn Doman/

Shawn Doman
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 60,362
Telephone: (512) 439-5092
Facsimile: (512) 439-5099